

DEPARTMENT • OF • WATER • RESOURCES
CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN
♦ UPDATE 2005 ♦

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP COMMENTS
BAKERSFIELD, CA

<i>Date:</i>	June 28, 2005 1:00 - 5:00 pm	<i>Location:</i>	Bakersfield Kern County Water Agency 3200 Rio Mirada Drive
<i>Meeting Purpose and Goals:</i>	To hear and record public comment on the Public Review Draft of the California Water Plan Update 2005		
<i>All meeting materials, including the PowerPoint presentation, are available at the California Water Plan website at: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm</i>			

Presenters:

Lloyd Fryer, Advisory Committee member, Kern County Water Agency

Kamyar Guivetchi, Manager, Statewide Water Planning, CA Department of Water Resources (DWR)

Paula Landis, District Chief, San Joaquin District, DWR

Julia Lee, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy, CA State University, Sacramento

Introduction: Format and Purpose

Julia Lee, meeting facilitator, introduced the presenters and DWR staff and welcomed everyone to the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Public Input Workshop in Bakersfield. She thanked the Kern County Water Agency for providing the meeting facility. The purpose of the meeting was for the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR) to receive public input and to share ideas for the Public Review Draft of the CA Water Plan.

The workshop format was interactive. Participants sat in table groups. The meeting consisted of 3 presentations by Kamyar Guivetchi (DWR), each followed by group discussion at each table. Advisory Committee member Lloyd Fryer spoke via conference phone on behalf of the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Advisory Committee, and DWR San Joaquin District Chief Paula Landis gave a presentation on the Tulare Lake- and San Joaquin River Regional Reports, which are located in Volume 3 of the CA Water Plan. Each table station had a DWR staff person who helped record the group discussion on a flipchart. Each table group chose a reporter among themselves who would summarize the group discussion to the entire audience on behalf of the group. Near the end of the meeting, time was reserved for a traditional spoken comment period for individuals to orally present prepared statements. For a detailed description of the format, see the “Working in Groups” handout.

Part 1 – Agenda Items A and B

A) Background & Overview / B) Comments from the Advisory Committee

This *Water Plan Update* is different than previous updates. It was prepared using a new process. There are many new features in the Water Plan. It will be continually updated as new information becomes available, and it presents a strategic plan and framework for action developed with substantial

stakeholder input. Kamyar Guivetchi spoke on the content and strategic planning process used in the Water Plan. Advisory Committee member Lloyd Fryer explained the *Advisory Committee View*, a 4-page handout prepared by the Advisory Committee that summarizes the areas of agreement and points of disagreement among the 65-member Advisory Committee over the last four and a half years, and uncertainties remaining in the Water Plan.

Below is a summary of the comments made at the tables:

Thinking about the presentation on Background and Overview by DWR and Comments from the Advisory Committee, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Liked the overarching strategic plan, gave politicians and the water management community a guideline of something to put hands on + Proper numbers and data. + Liked the Foundational Actions. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Liked multiple scenarios. + Add scenario that considers the possibility of increasing agriculture. + Add plots of future use for a range forecast (instead of a line forecast) + There should be a recommendation to remove roadblocks and modify water rights permits. + This scenario allows people to implement best management practices + Coming to SWRCB may open up problems with water permits. + Good that DWR emphasizes working together on a regional level. + Liked improvement of water transfers, from high water areas to water short areas. 	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Reach out more to agriculture/farmers regarding prime land. Δ Address use of urban recycled solid waste (sewage sludge) Δ Guidelines to help locals start integrated regional water management. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Wasn't satisfied with the described relationship between land use and water use. Courts settled and said that you need to have proof of water supplies before building new subdivisions. Need a formula that developers can use to determine adequate water availability for future or proposed developments. Δ Need for state regulations for private water companies. 	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional planning should consider inter-regional concerns. • Who is in charge of implementing actual plans? • Are regions given authority? If so, is there support at the state level? • What is the definition of reliable supplies? No single definition. Suggest using regional supply by hydrologic region. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has detailed study of benefits of regional water privatization been done? • How can agricultural acreage remain constant in 3 scenarios while population increases? • How does metering/pricing affect total potential conservation %. • What was DWR's outreach when creating scenarios (were developers consulted)? • How can we identify impacts from Tehachapi development while they are split between Tulare Lake and South Lahontan regions? • Can we have detailed discussion of impacts for this particular regions? • Is there any study for the water use in the mountain areas, such as the Frasier Park area in Kern County?

Part 2 – Agenda Items C and D

C) California Water Today & Water Balance / D) Regional Reports

It is important for a strategic plan to have a clear description of current conditions and situations. Chapter 3 of Volume 1: Strategic Plan is called “California Water Today.” As the largest chapter in Volume 1 (about 120 pages), it is intended to provide education and reference information. It gives general findings from both statewide and regional perspectives as well as the perspectives of different water use sectors (agriculture, urban, and environment). Volume 3 of the Water Plan has more detailed information on each of the 10 hydrologic regions (plus additional reports for Statewide, Mountain Counties, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta), covering conditions, challenges, accomplishments, and future opportunities of the Region presented, as well as quantified water balances for supply and use. Kamyar Guivetchi presented the California Water today and statewide water balances, and San Joaquin District Chief Paula Landis presented the Volume 3 regional reports for the Tulare Lake hydrologic region.

Below is a summary of the comments made by individuals at the tables in response to these questions:

Thinking about the description of California Water Today and the Regional Reports, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">+ Liked having 3 years of Water Balances – the range represents statistically significant years of variations.+ Water Flow Diagrams recommend adding routing/optimization diagram (interconnection of systems) <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">+ Liked the emphasis on conservation.+ Improved discussion on water transfers.+ Liked admission that data are incomplete.+ Liked emphasis of regional focus, with recognition of importance of state/regional cooperation.+ Liked regional reports.+ Liked supply/demand charts.+ Water balance charts are helpful as a general overview, but don't know how accurate.	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Δ Identify imported and local supplies on a regional level on histograms for each year of water balance. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Δ Need formula to determine if adequate water is available for future proposed development.Δ Add maps of potential groundwater recharge areas.Δ Need more detailed analysis of local groundwater basins/surface water interaction.Δ More information on impacts of federal contracts.Δ Need more information on the effects of local and state laws.Δ Explain the difference between precipitation fall and surface supply.Δ Describe total water balance.Δ Check accuracy of regional report balances – do they add up to the state balance?Δ Discuss interstate water supply impacts (Colorado River)	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The 3 years of Water Balances do not indicate the range of extreme hydrology.• Current conditions should evaluate “worst case” drought.• Add imported vs. local components to surface water in the regional histogram graphs. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• When will the Mountain Counties Regional Report be available?• Where is all the precipitation going? Does the excess go to the environment?• The graph only shows a partial water balance.• Agricultural water use differs from the regional to the statewide level; it is misleading to look at the graph. Make sure those figures are correct.• Why is crop acreage changing? Is it because farmers can make more money by selling water than farming?• Concern: We have no or little

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Need better public education/outreach. Δ State Water Project water is cheap. Explain how the aqueduct water is not cheap and how you pay even if you don't get your allotment. Δ Explain how federal and state water is distributed. Δ Need to emphasize more agricultural and urban conservation. Δ Is there a discussion on the Frasier Park area? It is a massive development. Δ Scenarios seem too similar to one another. Δ Privatization of water needs to be regulated. 	<p>control over population growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water is a finite quantity. • Smaller communities need technical assistance by DWR. • As population increases, agricultural water is also needed to furnish food. • Do we want to allow the population to escalate uncontrolled to over run agricultural capacity? • How can agriculture remain constant if the population increases?
--	--	--

Part 3 – Agenda Items E and F

E) Preparing for the Future (Scenarios) / F) Diversifying Responses (Strategies)

This *Water Plan Update 2005* recognizes that many things may alter water use and supplies between now and 2030. For that reason, the *Update* contains a description of three plausible yet different future scenarios. Uncertainty about future course of events creates a need for multiple options to address opportunities and challenges. Further, the Plan recognizes that one size does not fit all regions of the state. Each region will have specific requirements or needs that may not apply across the entire state. Implementing multiple options (diverse management strategies) allows water planners and managers to adapt to a variety of circumstances. Volume 2 (Resource Management Strategies) has narrative descriptions for 25 different management strategies available to help them reduce water demand, improve operational efficiency and transfers, increase water supply, improve water quality, and practice resource stewardship.

Below is a summary of the comments made by individuals at the tables in response to these questions:

Thinking from the perspective of 2030 are there things about this approach to plan for the future you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>Table 1:</p> <p>+ Liked having multiple scenarios.</p>	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Want to see plots of future use for a range forecast (instead of a line forecast), similar to New Yorker, May 9, 2005, page 56. Δ There should be a recommendation to remove roadblocks, modification of water rights permits; coming to 	<p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you find out when water leaves the area and how the basins are connected?

	SWRCB may open up problems with water permits. Δ Reduce governmental red tape; make water transfers easier without losing water rights.	
--	--	--

Part 4 – Additional Public Comments

- Why are there no agricultural interests represented at this meeting?
 - Why are there no developers/builders represented at this meeting?
 - Will there be public education campaigns for water use efficiency?
 - Has DWR mapped water intake (Kern Water Bank)?

Part 5 – Formal Public Comments (in order of presentation):

Members of the public were welcome to present statements in the formal style of a traditional public hearing. One member of the public was registered for speaker comments:

Lois Watson, League of Women Voters:

The League of Women Voters California “supports measures which promote the management and development of water resources in ways that are beneficial to the environment with emphasis on conservation and high standards of water quality that are appropriate for intended use.”

The League agrees with the California Water Plan Update that California needs a sustainable and reliable water supply through 2030 and beyond. To ensure that water supplies are reliable, there needs to be an integrated regional water management system that promotes efficient use of water and protects water quality in ways that protects and restores the environment.

The League of Women Voters California’s position of statement on Water includes, along with several other important concepts, support for integrating water resources planning with land use planning to provide for future needs; encouragement of off-stream storage and discouragement of additional on-stream dams; and encouragement of water pricing policies which reflect development and delivery costs while protecting low or fixed income water uses by lifeline rates.

Part 6 – Closing

Kamyar and Julia thanked the audience for participating in the public comment workshop and for their comments. He reminded everyone that the public review period will last through July 22, to allow for 60 days since the release of the printed Public Review Draft document.

The final comment deadline is July 22.

Attendance:

Public:

David Ansolabehere, Cawelo Water District
Ches Arthur, Sierra Club
Jim Beck, Kern County Water Agency
Gary Bucher, Kern County Water Agency
Brad Caudill, Tulare Lake Farm Bureau
Steve Collup, Arvin-Edison Water District
Curtis Creel, Kern County Water Agency
April England, Kern County Water Agency
Jerry Ezell, Shafter-Wasco Irrigation District
Denis Fox, Soil and Water Conservation Society
Scott Hamilton, Paramount Farming Company
Rick Iger, Kern County Water Agency
Mary Ann Lockhart, Sierra Club
Mark Mulkay, Kern Delta Water District
Renee D. Nelson, Clean Water & Air Matters
Sheridan Nicholas, Kern Delta Water District
Kane Totzke, Kern County Water Agency
Arthur Unger, Public
Lois Watson, League of Women Voters - Bakersfield

Staff:

Paul Dabbs, DWR
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR
Paula Landis, DWR
Julia Lee, CCP
Mike McGinnis, DWR
Chris Montoya, DWR
David Scruggs, DWR
Gholam Shakouri, DWR
David Sumi, CCP
Iris Yamagata, DWR